REMARKS

The applicant originally submitted claims 1-21 in this application. In a response to a previous Office Action mailed May 9, 2006, the applicant amended claims 1 and 8 and canceled claims 2 and 12-21. In a response to a previous Office Action mailed January 9, 2007, the applicant amended claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8 and 11, and canceled claims 4, 6 and 9. In this response to the current Office Action, the applicant has amended claim 8, but has not canceled any claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 remain pending in this application. The applicant has not added any new matter to the claims or to the specification.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner indicated that claim 8 recites a rotationally stationary preform, which is dependent on a rotational preform in claim 1, and that both states can not occur simultaneously.

In response to the rejection, the applicant has amended claim 8 by rewriting the claim in independent form. Thus, claim 8, as amended, is not dependent on claim 1, and therefore no longer is indefinite. Also, the applicant has amended claim 8 to include the step of spinning the optical fiber as the optical fiber is being drawn from the heated optical fiber preform. Support for the claim amendment is found in the applicant's description, e.g., in paragraphs [0007] and [0025]. In view of claim 8, as amended, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Fujimaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,789,399). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the remarks set forth below.

As discussed in the remarks of the previous response, the applicant's claimed invention recites a method for making optical fiber that includes both rotating the preform relative to the heat source as the preform is being heated, and spinning the optical fiber as it is being drawn from the heated preform. Also,

as discussed in the remarks of the previous response, the applicant's use of both preform rotation and fiber spinning provides several advantages, e.g., compared to conventional methods that only rotate the preform or only spin the drawn fiber.

The Fujimaki et al. reference does not disclose or suggest the applicant's claimed method. The Fujimaki et al. reference discloses a method for measuring twisting of an optical fiber. As part of the discussion of the method for measuring such twisting, the Fujimaki et al. reference discloses a method for manufacturing an optical fiber in which the preform is rotated while being vertically inserted into a heating furnace. See Fujimaki et al. at col. 3, lines 7-13. Such language was cited by the Examiner.

The Fujimaki et al. reference also discloses a second embodiment of a method for manufacturing an optical fiber, in which two pulleys (21) are used to impart twisting on the optical fiber after it has been drawn through the heating furnace and coated. See Fujimaki et al. at col. 6, lines 19-29. Such language also was cited by the Examiner.

However, the applicant notes that, in such embodiment, the preform is not rotated. See Fujimaki et al. at col. 6, lines 35-36. That is, when a twist is imparted to the drawn optical fiber, the preform from which the optical fiber was drawn was not rotated when being inserted into the heating furnace. Therefore, the Fujimaki et al. does not disclose a method for manufacturing optical fiber in which both the preform is rotated and the optical fiber drawn from the preform is spun. Moreover, the Fujimaki et al. does not suggest such a method, since the Fujimaki et al. reference expressly states that the preform is not rotated when twisting is imparted to fiber drawn from the preform. Such language actually teaches away from the applicant's use of both preform rotation and fiber spinning.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the applicant's invention as recited in claim 1 is neither disclosed in nor suggested by the cited art. Pending claims 3, 5, 7, 10 and 11 depend directly from claim 1. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of

claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Fujimaki et al.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kato (JP Abstract 11130455). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the foregoing claim amendment to claim 8 and the remarks set forth below.

As discussed hereinabove, the applicant has amended claim 8 by rewriting it in independent form and by including a step of spinning the optical fiber as the optical fiber is being drawn from the heated optical fiber preform. Claim 8, as amended, includes both preform rotation and fiber spinning, which, as just discussed, is neither disclosed in nor suggested by Fujimaki et al. Kato, which is cited for its disclosure of a rotating furnace, does not cure the deficiencies of Fujimaki et al. in failing to disclose or suggest the applicant's claimed invention as recited in either independent claim 1 or independent amended claim 8. Therefore, in view of claim 8, as amended, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kato.

The applicant submits that all claims are in patentable form, and respectfully urge that all the claims be allowed and the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to call the attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Zhi Zhou

By: Michael A. Morra, Attorney
Reg. No. 28975
(770) 798-2040

Date: June 27, 2007

Furukawa Electric North America, Inc.
Docket Administrator
2000 Northeast Expressway
Suite 2H-02
Norcross, GA 30071-2906